



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CD
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/013,091	12/07/2001	Bahman Zargham	20206-124 (P01-3704-1)	2350
7590	06/29/2005		EXAMINER	
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY			NGUYEN, MERILYN P	
Attn: Bill Streeter Intellectual Property Administration P.O. Box 272400 Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2161	
DATE MAILED: 06/29/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/013,091	ZARGHAM ET AL.
	Examiner Merilyn P. Nguyen	Art Unit 2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 07 December 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/07/2001.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: Detailed Action.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-22 are pending in this office action.
2. This application claims priority from Provisional Application number 60285640 filed on 04/19/2001.

Acknowledges

3. Receipt is acknowledged of the following items:
 - o Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed on 07 December 2001 and made of record. The references cited on the PTOL 1449 form have been considered.

Specification

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
 - o Cross-reference must be updated at page 2, lines 8-11 of the specification.
Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

5. Claim 1, line 14, claim 11, line 10, claim 15, line 11, are objected to because of the use of slash. It is unclear whether the slash means AND, OR, or Both.
Regarding claim 22, line 6, there are two “.” at the end of the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 1, 14 and 15, lines 14-15, there are insufficient antecedent basis for “new messages” and “information extracted” and “subscribing to the enriched new messages” in the claim. For example, there is no information extracted beforehand. Also, it’s unclear what is subscribed to “enriched new messages”.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-13, 15-16 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Stewart (US 2002/0013759).

Regarding claims 1, 11 and 15, Stewart discloses a method, a system, and a computer readable medium embodying computer program code configured to cause a computer to perform steps for providing enriched publish and subscribe in an enterprise (See Figs 12-13, 21-23 and 26, and page 15, paragraphs [0233-0234], and pages 18-19, paragraphs [0303-0305]) running as a zero latency enterprise (ZLE) (See page 19, paragraph [0312]), the enterprise experiencing a plurality of events occurring in association with business transactions conducted at a plurality of sites across the enterprise (See page 13, paragraph [0196] and page 19, paragraph [0305]), the method comprising:

initiating, in real time, a process responsive to an event (See page 10, paragraph [0124]), the process including

- publishing to a central repository one or more messages prompted by that event containing information from that event (See page 10, paragraph [0124], lines 6-7), respective information from the plurality of events being aggregated in the central repository where the aggregated information can, in real-time, be accessible and available for extraction and analysis from across the enterprise (See [0150], [0227], lines 11-14, and [0279]),
- updating the aggregated information with information from the published messages (See [0280]),
- enriching new messages with information from that event and/or corresponding information extracted from the central repository (See [0227-0228]), and

- subscribing to the enriched new messages (See [0233]).

Regarding claims 2 and 12, Stewart discloses wherein the central repository operates as an information broker between applications such that applications publish messages to the central repository and subscribe to messages from the central, rather than exchange request-response messages directly with each other (See [0214-0216] and [0223]).

Regarding claims 3 and 21, Stewart discloses wherein for a particular number (N) of applications, a combined number of the published and subscribed messages can be reduced from twice that particular number (2N) to a total number of 4 or 5 messages (See [0305]).

Regarding claims 5 and 20, Stewart discloses predefining a schema for each of the applications, the schema identifying which of the plurality of events and types of data changes its respective application is interested in, the schema further identifying any information its respective application needs for performing tasks related to such events (See page 11, paragraphs [0137-0138], and page 18, paragraph [0282] to page 19, paragraph [0305]); and storing each schema in the central repository for later use in enriching the new messages (See page 11, paragraph [0137], lines 6-12).

Regarding claim 6, Stewart discloses wherein the applications cause the updating of aggregated information at the central repository upon a change of information in their environment (See page 11, paragraph [0137]).

Regarding claim 7, Stewart discloses wherein the published messages and subscribed messages are formatted in XML (See [0233-0234]).

Regarding claims 8 and 13, Stewart discloses wherein the central repository is based on a database which can be updated with information from new events while being queried and which can send the enriched messages to multiple subscribers, thereby leveraging an innate parallelism, scalability and reliability of the database (See paragraphs [0137-0139]).

Regarding claim 10, Stewart discloses wherein the enriched new messages to which an application subscribes can include extracted information that was previously published to the central repository by other one or more applications (See page 15, paragraphs [0227-0228]).

Regarding claim 16, this claim contains similar limitation as claim 1, thus rejected as addressed above.

Regarding claim 19, Stewart discloses wherein the particular information for enriching messages subscribed to by an application can be information previously published by another application (See [0305]).

Regarding claim 22, Stewart discloses further discloses an inference-based rules engine that finds an appropriate business rule, regardless of the complexity of rules or the size of any rules set, the inference-based rules engine facilitating a rules service that integrates the rules and policies of the enterprise in the ODS (See page 6, paragraph [0073] and page 9, paragraphs [0117] and [0120]); and a process-flow engine that manages a flow of the business transactions, processes, and messages between the applications integrated via the ZLE framework (Work Flow Server 104, Fig. 1, and [0081] and [0139]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 4 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart (US 2002/0013759), in view of Schmidt (US 2002/0026630).

Regarding claim 4, Stewart discloses all the claimed subject matter as set forth above in claim 1. However, Stewart is silent as to wherein the central repository provides a coherent view, in real time, of the aggregated information from across the enterprise, the process being founded on the coherent view of the aggregated information. On the other hand, Schmidt teaches an integrated view of the aggregated information from across the enterprise (See page 9,

paragraph [0253], [0288], Schmidt et al.). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to corporate a coherent view of Schmidt to the aggregated information of Stewart. The motivation would have been providing browsing for desired information.

Regarding claim 18, Stewart/Schmidt discloses wherein the consolidated information can, in real-time, be accessible and available for extraction and analysis from across the enterprise (See [0150], [0227], lines 11-14, and [0279], Stewart et al.), the ODS providing for a coherent view of the consolidated information, in real time, from across the enterprise as addressed above in claim 4.

9. Claims 9, 14 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shapiro (US 2003/0093507), in view of Chandra (US 6,058,389).

Regarding claims 9 and 14, Stewart discloses all the claimed subject matter as set forth above. However, Stewart is silent as to wherein the central repository includes relational database management functionality that caches and queues the published and subscribed messages. On the other hand, Chandra teaches relational database management functionality that caches and queues the published and subscribed messages (See col. 4, lines 6-16, and col. 35, lines 15-67, Chandra et al.). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have a relational database management functionality that caches and queues the published and subscribed messages as suggested by Chandra. The motivation would have been to store published and subscribed messages in a predetermined order so that messages would be easily managed, queried, or handled in later time.

Regarding claim 17, Stewart/ Chandra discloses wherein the ODS is configured with a cluster-aware relational database management (RDBMS) functionality that is capable of handling periodic queries (See col. 35, lines, 20-21, Chandra et al.), message queueing and store state engine operations (See col. 35, lines 30-48, Chandra et al.), and handling transactions, including insertion, updating and deletion of transactions (See col. 3, lines 40-67, Chandra et al.).

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Jun-Jang Jeng, Josef Schiefer, and Henry Change, "An Agent-based Architecture for Analyzing Business Processes of Real-Time Enterprises" (1994).

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Merilyn P Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-4026. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 571-272-4023. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-746-7240 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Frantz Coby
FRANTZ COBY
PRIMARY EXAMINER

MN
June 23, 2005